

REMARKS

The Examiner has required restriction of the claimed invention, and listed the following group classifications:


Group	Claim(s)	Description
I	1-6 & 22-25	methods of identifying schizophrenia biomarkers
II	7 & 8	methods of diagnosing schizophrenia
III	9-15	kits
IV	16-21	methods for screening compounds

Applicants hereby elect to prosecute the claims of Group I, *with traverse* of the restriction between the claims of Group II. The Examiner admits the inventions of Groups I and II are related in his statement that “[i]nvention group I is a method of finding an association between a single nucleotide polymorphism (SNP) and schizophrenia, whereas group II is a method of diagnosing a patient using the results of the first method” (Office Action, page 3). Even so Applicants disagree with the Examiner’s description of Group I as “a method of finding an association between a SNP and schizophrenia.” As recited in Claim 1, step b, the methods entail “detecting the presence of at least one polymorphism,” which in some embodiments listed in dependent Claims 2 and 3 is an *oligonucleotide* insertion. Similarly, the definition of polymorphism provided in the Specification states that in preferred embodiments, the term “refers to *at least one* substitution, insertion and/or deletion in the 5’ untranslated region of alpha7” (Specification, at page 55, lines 12 and 13, emphasis added).

In addition, Applicants strongly disagree with the Examiner’s contention that a search of the methods of group I and group II would constitute an undue burden, since the searches are entirely different and not coextensive, and the subject matter divergent” (Office Action, page 3). Applicants respectfully remind the Examiner that the methods of Groups I and II *share* steps a, b and c and therefore *cannot* be entirely different and/or wholly divergent. In fact, the methods of Groups I and II are clearly directed to the same subject matter (e.g., genetic contribution to schizophrenia). Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that Claims 1-8 be examined in the instant application, with sequencing as the elected species.

Applicants further request consideration of the references listed on the Information Disclosure Statement submitted herewith, before the mailing of a first substantive Office Action. Should the Examiner believe that a telephone interview would aid in the prosecution of this application, Applicants encourage the Examiner to call the undersigned collect.

Dated: March 7, 2006

By: 
Christine A. Lekutis
Registration No. 51,934

MEDLEN & CARROLL, LLP
101 Howard Street, Suite 350
San Francisco, California 94105
415.904.6500